

**REMARKS**

In response to the election of species requirement set forth in the Office Action mailed November 30, 2005, Applicant elects the species of Fig. 2, with traverse. At least claims 1-9, 17-25, 33-41 and 49-53 are readable on the elected species.

As noted by the Examiner, upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. Applicant submits that newly added claim 53 is generic to both species identified by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully submits that the inventions associated with Figs. 2 and 4 are closely related to each other, and it would not be a serious burden to examine the entire application at this time.

For example, while the inventions of Figs. 2 and 4 are directed to different embodiments, they are all directed to an active pixel sensor in which a reset voltage and an integration voltage are stored within the pixel until the voltages are forwarded to a differential amplifier.

M.P.E.P. § 803 directs as follows (emphasis added): “If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.” Given the circumstances of this case, it would not be a serious burden for the Examiner to examine all of the claims at this time. The directive of § 803 should be followed by the Examiner in this case.

Favorable action on the application is solicited.

Dated: December 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No. 28,371

Salvatore P. Tamburo

Registration No. 45,153

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant